EXHIBIT A

	E90glucp	_						
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK							
2	X							
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA							
4	v.	14 MJ 1878(JMF)						
5	MICHAEL LUCARELLI,							
6	Defendant.	•						
7	X							
8		New York, N.Y.						
9		September 24, 2014 10:40 a.m.						
10	Before:							
11		IDMAN.						
12	HON. JESSE M. FU							
13		District Judge						
14	APPEARANCES	3						
15								
16	PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the							
17	Southern District of New York A. DAMIAN WILLIAMS Assistant United States Attorney							
18	CUOMO LAW, LLC							
19	Attorneys for Defendant PATRICK W. MCGINLEY							
20	LAURENT B. CHEVALIER							
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								

E90glucp

(Case called)

THE COURT: Good morning.

I have been advised, Mr. Lucarelli, that you wish to waive indictment and consent to the filing of an information charging you with one count of securities fraud and enter a guilty plea to that charge.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Before I accept your guilty plea, I'm going to ask you certain questions to ensure that you are pleading guilty because you are, in fact, guilty. You do not need to stand; you can remain seated, except in a moment when I'll ask you to stand to take the oath.

In any event, I'll ask you these questions to ensure that you are pleading guilty because you are, in fact, guilty and not for some other reason; to ensure that you understand the rights that you would be giving up by pleading guilty; and to ensure that you understand the potential consequences of a guilty plea, including the sentence that could be imposed upon you.

It is essential that you understand each of my questions before you answer them. So if you do not or if you would like to speak with your lawyers at any point for whatever reason, just let me know and either they will explain the question to you or I will explain the question to you. And, in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

any event, if you want to speak with them, I'm happy to give you how ever much time you need to do so.

Understood?

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Before we proceed further, I'd ask my deputy to administer the oath to the defendant.

(Defendant sworn)

THE COURT: You are now under oath, Mr. Lucarelli, which means that if you answer any of my questions falsely, you may be subject to prosecution for the separate crime of perjury.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: What is your full name?

THE DEFENDANT: My full, legal name is Michael Anthony Dupree Lucarelli.

THE COURT: How old are you, Mr. Lucarelli?

THE DEFENDANT: As of today, my birthday, I'm 52 years old.

THE COURT: Happy birthday, though this is not how you would like to spend your birthday. In any event, happy birthday.

How far did you go in school?

THE DEFENDANT: Masters in business.

THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized

E90glucp

for any type of mental illness?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been under the care of a doctor or a psychiatrist?

THE DEFENDANT: Just a medical doctor, not for psychiatric.

THE COURT: Can you briefly describe the nature of the treatment that you are having or what it's for.

THE DEFENDANT: For the past 20 years, I've suffered from Crohn's disease and anal fissures and other complications. And I've had a resection of intestine taken out in surgery. And I've tried every known drug. There is no cure and it's quite painful.

THE COURT: Is there anything about those conditions or your treatment for it that would affect your ability to understand what is happening here today?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized for any type of addiction, including drug or alcohol addiction?

THE DEFENDANT: No. Well, I'm currently in a pretrial Narcotic Anonymous program.

THE COURT: Is there anything about your treatment through that program, or the reasons for your being in that program, that would interfere with your ability to understand what is going on here today?

· 25

guilty this time?

1 THE DEFENDANT: No. 2 THE COURT: In the last 48 hours, have you taken any 3 drugs, medicine, pills or had any alcohol? THE DEFENDANT: No. 4 5 THE COURT: You haven't taken any medicine in 6 connection with your medical condition in the last 48 hours? THE DEFENDANT: No. 7 THE COURT: Is your mind clear today? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 10 THE COURT: Do you understand what is happening here 11 today? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Mr. McGinley, have you discussed this 13 matter with Mr. Lucarelli? 14 15 MR. MCGINLEY: I have, on several occasions. THE COURT: Does he understand the rights that he 16 17 would be giving up by pleading guilty? 18 MR. MCGINLEY: Yes. We spent much time talking about 19 that. 20 THE COURT: In your judgment, is he capable of 21 understanding the nature of these proceedings? 22 MR. MCGINLEY: He is. 23 THE COURT: Do either counsel have any doubt as to the 24 defendant's competence to waive indictment or enter a plea of

MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor. 1 2 MR. MCGINLEY: No, your Honor. THE COURT: On the basis of Mr. Lucarelli's responses 3 4 to my questions, my observations of his demeanor here in court 5 and the representations of counsel, I find that he is fully 6 competent to enter an informed plea of quilty at this time. 7 Mr. Lucarelli, have you received a copy of the information containing the charge to which you intend to plead 8 9 guilty? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Have you read it? 11 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Do you waive its public reading or would 14 you like me to read it out loud? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Waive the public reading. 16 THE COURT: Have you had enough time to discuss with 17 your lawyers the charge to which you intend to plead guilty and 18 any possible defenses to that charge? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Have your lawyers explained to you the 21 consequences of entering a quilty plea? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Are you satisfied with their 24 representation of you? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

7

E90glucp

1 THE COURT: I have a waiver-of-indictment form here 2 that appears to have been signed by you dated today, 3 September 24, 2014. Is that your signature appearing there on 4 that form? 5 I'll have my deputy bring it over and show it to you. 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Before you signed that form, did you read 8 it? THE DEFENDANT: I signed a lot of forms this morning. 9 10 I may have read it. 11 THE COURT: I'm happy to hand it back to you. You can 12 take a moment to read it and then I'll confirm that you have done so. 13 14 (Pause) 15 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. THE COURT: Before you signed that form, did you 16 discuss it with your lawyers? 17 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Did they explain it to you and answer 19 whatever questions you may have had about the form? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Do you understand that you are under no 22 23 obligation to waive indictment? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Do you understand that if you did not 25

E90glucp

waive indictment and the government wished to prosecute you for the crime charged in the information, that it would have to present that crime to a grand jury which might or might not indict you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that by waiving indictment, you are giving up your right to have this case presented to a grand jury?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand what a grand jury is?

THE DEFENDANT: I believe it's 12 jurors. That's about it. That's all I know.

THE COURT: It is not actually 12 jurors. It is a body composed of 23 citizens of whom 16 must be present, that is, 16 is a quorum; and it determines whether the government has presented evidence that is sufficient to show probable cause that somebody committed a crime. And at least 12 people must vote in favor of an indictment in order for an indictment to be returned.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that absent a waiver of your right to be indicted, that the only way you could be charged with a felony in federal court is based on an indictment returned by a grand jury of that sort.

1 Do you understand that? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Do either counsel know of any reason that 3 I should not find that the defendant has knowingly and 4 voluntarily waived his right to be indicted by a grand jury? 5 6 MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor. 7 MR. MCGINLEY: No, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: I find that the defendant has knowingly and voluntarily waived his right to be indicted by a grand jury 9 10 and I authorize the filing of the information. 11 I'm going to ask my deputy now to bring you a written 12 advice-of-rights form that I have marked as Court Exhibit 1 that you appear to have signed and dated last week, 13 September 17. 14 15 I'll ask you to look at page two and confirm that that 16 is your signature. 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Before you signed that form, did you read it? 19 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Before you signed it, did you discuss it 21 22 with your lawyers? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Did they explain it to you and answer 24 25 whatever questions you may have had about it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I will provide that form to the government to retain in its possession after this proceeding. I'm also going to go over with you many of the same things orally to ensure that you understand the rights that you have and the rights that you are giving up by entering a guilty plea.

Once again, if there is anything that you do not understand, let me know and either your lawyers or I can explain it to you more fully.

Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, you have the right to plead not guilty to the charge in the information.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If you did plead not guilty, you would be entitled to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charge in the information.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: At that trial, you would be presumed to be innocent and you would not have to prove that you were innocent. Instead, the government would be required to prove your guilt by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt before the jury could find you guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: In order to find you guilty, a jury of 12 people would have to agree unanimously that you were guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: At that trial, and at every stage of your case, you would be entitled to the assistance of a lawyer. If you could not afford a lawyer, one would be appointed at public expense, free of cost to you to represent you.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: During a trial, the witnesses for the government would have to come to court and testify in your presence and your lawyers would have an opportunity to cross-examine those witnesses and object to evidence offered by the government against you. You would also have an opportunity to introduce evidence on your own behalf if you so desired and you would have the right to have subpoenas issued or other process used to compel witnesses to come to court and testify in your defense.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: At a trial, although you would have the right to testify if you chose to do so, you would also have the right not to testify. And if you chose not to testify, no one,

including the jury, could draw any inference or suggestion of guilt from the fact that you did not testify.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Before trial, you would have an opportunity to seek suppression or exclusion of any evidence that the government would offer against you at trial.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If you were convicted at a trial, you would have the right to appeal that verdict.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If you plead guilty, you will also have to give up your right not to incriminate yourself because I may ask you questions about what you did in order to satisfy myself that you are guilty as charged, and you will have to admit and acknowledge your guilt.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If you plead guilty, and if I accept your plea, you will give up your right to a trial and the other rights that we have just discussed, other than your right to a lawyer which you keep whether or not you plead guilty. But there will be no trial and I will enter a judgment of guilty

and sentence you on the basis of your plea after I have considered a presentence report prepared by the United States Probation Department and any submissions that I get from the lawyers in this case.

There will be no appeal with respect to whether you did or did not commit the offense charged in Count One of the information or with respect to whether the government could or could not use the evidence that it has against you.

Do you understand all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: One question: Is probation pretrial services or --

THE COURT: No. Both are arms of the Court. Pretrial services supervises defendants in the pretrial period; but after conviction, whether at trial or on a guilty plea, probation is a related office that prepares a presentence report to assist in the process of sentencing and then ultimately supervises defendants who are in either supervised release or probation.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Even now, as you are entering this plea, you have the right to change your mind, to plead not guilty and to go to trial on the charge in the information.

(212) 805-0300

Do you understand that?.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand each and every one of the rights that I have explained to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you willing to give up your right to a trial and the other rights that we have discussed?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you are charged in Count One with securities fraud in violation of, among other things, Title 15, United States Code, Section 78j(b) and 78ff.

Do you understand that that is the charge?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Williams, would you please state the elements of that offense.

MR. WILLIAMS: Certainly, your Honor. There are three elements. First, that in connection with the purchase or sale of various LHA client securities, that the defendant employed a device, scheme or artifice to defraud or engaged in an act, practice or course of business that operated, or would operate, as a fraud or deceit upon a purchaser or seller of a specified security.

Second, that when he engaged in the scheme, that the defendant acted knowingly, willfully and with the intent to defraud his employer LHA, his client or the market.

Third, that the mail or an interstate communication facility or facility of a national security exchange was used

in furtherance of the scheme to defraud.

The government must prove each of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

THE COURT: Mr. Lucarelli, do you understand, as Mr. Williams just indicated, that if you were to go to trial, the government would have to prove each of those elements beyond a reasonable doubt before the jury could find you guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the government would also have to prove, albeit only by a preponderance of the evidence, that some act in connection with the crime took place in this district giving rise to venue.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Let me tell you now about the maximum possible penalties for this crime, and by maximum, I mean the most that could possibly be imposed upon you. It doesn't necessarily mean that that is the sentence you will receive, but you have to understand that by pleading guilty, you are exposing yourself to a combination of punishments up to the maximum that I'm about to tell you.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Let me tell you first about the possible

restrictions on your liberty.

The maximum term of imprisonment for this crime is 20 years, which can be followed by up to three years of supervised release. Supervised release means that you would be subject to supervision by the probation department. There would be rules of supervised release that you would be required to follow, and if you violate any of those rules, you could be returned to prison to serve additional time without a jury trial and without credit for either the time spent on your underlying sentence or the time spent on postrelease supervision.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: One second. Yes.

THE COURT: You should understand that there is no parole in the federal system and that if you were sentenced to prison, you would not be released early on parole. There is a limited opportunity to earn credit for good behavior, but if you were sentenced to prison, you would have to serve at least 85 percent of the time to which you were sentenced.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: In addition to those restrictions on your liberty, the maximum possible punishment also includes certain financial penalties. First, the maximum allowable fine is the greatest of \$5 million, twice the gross pecuniary gain, that is, financial gain derived from the offense, or twice the gross

pecuniary loss to someone other than you as a result of the offense. Second, I can order restitution to any person or entity injured as a result of your criminal conduct.

Mr. Williams, is there any restitution at issue here; and if so, does the government have a preliminary calculation of what it would be?

MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, at this point, restitution has not been raised by LHA; however, it could come up subsequent to this plea, your Honor.

Forfeiture, however, has been fully set forth in the consent preliminary order of forfeiture that your Honor has.

THE COURT: I'll get to that in a moment.

Mr. Lucarelli, do you want an opportunity to speak with counsel?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. One second.

So you're only coming after me for these assets; is that correct?

THE COURT: I'm not coming after you for anything.

I'm just advising you what the maximum possible penalties are
for the offense to which I understand you're pleading guilty.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: I want to make sure that you understand one aspect of that maximum penalty can be restitution to any person or entity injured as a result of your criminal conduct.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: In addition, I can order you to forfeit all property derived from the offense or used to facilitate the offense.

In that regard, I note that in the plea agreement that I understand you have entered into with the government, you admit to the forfeiture allegation with respect to Count One of the information and agree to forfeit to the United States certain property, including \$955,000 and change, as well as some specific property, the illegal contents of an options express account. And that is also set forth in the consent order of forfeiture that has been submitted to me and I believe think you have signed.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Finally, I must order a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Do you understand that those are the maximum possible penalties?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you a citizen of the United States,
Mr. Lucarelli?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that by pleading guilty, you may lose certain valuable civil rights to the extent that

you have them or could otherwise obtain them now, such as the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury and the right to possess any kind of firearm.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you serving any other sentence, either state or federal, or being prosecuted in any other court at this time?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if your lawyer or anyone else has attempted to predict for you what your sentence will be in this case, that their predictions could be wrong?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: It's important for you to understand that no one, not your lawyer, not the lawyer for the government, no one can give you any assurances or promises as to what your sentence will be and that is because your sentence will be determined by me and by me alone, and I'm not going to do that today.

Instead, I will wait until I get the presentence report prepared by the United States Probation Department that I mentioned earlier. I will do my own independent calculation of how the United States Sentencing Guidelines apply to your case and consider any possible departures from the guidelines

range.

I will consider any submissions that I get from the lawyers, as well as the factors set forth in the statute that governs sentencing, which is Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a). And I will do all of that before determining and imposing an appropriate sentence on you.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor and yes.

THE COURT: Have you discussed that process with your lawyers?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, even if your sentence is different from what your lawyers or anyone else has told you that it might be, even if it is different from what you expect or hope it to be, and even if it is different from what may be in the written plea agreement that we will talk about in a moment, you will still be bound by your guilty plea and you will not be allowed to withdraw that plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, as I mentioned, I understand that there is a written plea agreement that you and your lawyers have entered into with lawyers for the government.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I have the original letter plea agreement here dated September 16, 2014, from assistant United States
Attorneys Damian Williams and Brian Blais, addressed to Oscar Michelen at the firm that Mr. McGinley belongs to.

Mr. Michelen is another one of your lawyers. Is that correct?

MR. MCGINLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: I will mark this as Court Exhibit 2 and provide it to the government to retain in its possession after these proceedings.

I'll ask my deputy to show you Court Exhibit 2 and ask you to look at the last page where it appears that you have signed and dated it today, but I want to confirm that.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Before you signed the plea agreement, did you read it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Before you signed it, did you discuss it with your lawyers?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Did they explain it to you and any questions you had about the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Before you signed the plea agreement, did you fully understand it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: One of the features of your agreement with the government is that you and the government have agreed on how the United States Sentencing Guidelines apply to your case.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You should understand that that agreement is binding on you and it is binding on the government, but it is not binding on me. As I mentioned, I have my own independent obligation to determine the correct guidelines range and to determine an appropriate sentence.

I am not suggesting to you that I will come up with a different calculation than the one to which you and the government have agreed, but I could, and even if I did and even if the range I calculate is higher than the range set forth in your agreement with the government, you would still be bound by your guilty plea and you will not be allowed to withdraw your plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Another feature of your plea agreement is that you have agreed to waive your right to appeal or otherwise challenge a sentence within or below the stipulated sentencing guidelines range of 37 to 46 months' imprisonment; that means that if I sentence you to 46 months in prison or anything less

E9	0a	1	u	c	c

than 46 months in prison, you would have no right to appeal or otherwise challenge that sentence.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Does this written plea agreement constitute your complete and total understanding of the entire agreement between you and the government?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Has anything been left out of the written plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Other than what is written in this agreement and the consent preliminary order of forfeiture, has anyone made any promise to you or offered you any inducement to plead guilty or to sign the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Has anyone threatened you or forced you to plead guilty or to sign the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Has anyone made any promise to you as to what your sentence will be?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Lucarelli, I'd like you now to tell me in your own words what you did that makes you believe that you are guilty of the crime charged in Count One of the

information.

THE DEFENDANT: It's about one page or less.

Your Honor, I apologize to the Court for my decision to trade on material nonpublic information. While working at LHA, I was granted access to the company server which sometimes contained draft press releases for LHA clients. I would sometimes use the information contained in these draft press releases to influence my decisions in my personal trading activity. I would buy stocks before the issuance of the final press release and selling immediately thereafter. Though I did not give any of this information to anyone, I was aware that I should not have used this information for my own personal trading.

I was unhappy, along with some others, in my employment with LHA. As an independent contractor with no signed employee agreements of any kind, I was not paid commissions for approximately one year. And I should have quit and pursued another avenue, including a lawsuit, but, instead, I began actively trading based on the PR information.

As I traded and working long hours, sometimes 14 to 16 hours a day, as I said before, plagued with serious medical conditions Crohn's disease and anal fissures, where there's no cures for these problems, I also never took vacations in the two years that I was there or lavishly spent money. The seized brokerage accounts by the government also include my life

savings.

After trying every other prescribed drug from my doctors since my surgery in 2004, at LHA, to work these hours, I turned to cocaine. The pain and the energy necessary to work these long hours, but -- can I have some water?

THE COURT: My deputy is going to go look for a cup.

We don't have it readily in the courtroom. Why don't you take

your time, and if you want to wait until she comes back and

collect your thoughts, that's fine.

THE DEFENDANT: But none of this excuses my gambling addiction to day trading. Fueled by anger of not getting paid by my employer, physical pain and the dependence on the drugs, I made a serious mistake for which I'm pleading guilty this morning.

I've been in this business for 25 years and have never run afoul of the criminal law. As I traded actively, I do not recall each trade that depended on material nonpublic information as I did thousands of trades, but I do recall trading all of these companies under these circumstances during the periods alleged.

I mention these provocations to the Court not as a justification but to indicate why I was tempted to stray from best practices. In my 25-year career, I wasn't strong enough to resist. I am remorseful and very sorry. Thank you.

THE COURT: Let me just follow up with a few

. 16

questions, and I should also say that obviously in connection with sentencing, you would have an opportunity to speak to me further and provide an explanation of your conduct and any other context that you think would be helpful to me in deciding a sentence.

For today's purposes, let me first ask you, did you owe a duty to LHA not to trade on the information that you obtained through your work there?

THE DEFENDANT: Can you ask that again.

THE COURT: Did you owe a duty to LHA not to trade on the information that you obtained through your work at LHA?

THE DEFENDANT: I'll answer that two ways: The very first client that I brought to LHA, which was a 10,000-a-month client and LHA was paying me 10,000 a month as an independent contractor, I was told I had to have that client to join the firm; that client demanded that I own stock and wanted a copy of my statement that said I owned stock because -- they used the term "skin in the game." And a lot of clients want you to own stock. If you're a signed employee, which I was not, you can't because you've signed an agreement that you won't buy any of the stock, so that's how I would answer that question.

But I do understand from my counsel that though I was an independent contractor with no signed employee agreements, there could have been a fiduciary obligation, even though the clients asked me to buy stock. And I told LHA with that first

client, you know, that he demanded I buy stock.

THE COURT: Did you understand that you were not allowed by LHA to trade on material nonpublic information that you obtained by virtue of working there, whether as an employee or an independent contractor?

Did you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I guess my answer to that would be not specifically because they received stock in cash -- I should say stock and/or cash from clients that they signed. So they owned stock, the partners and some of the employees, including -- some of finder's fees included, which I did not receive, included stock in the clients that I signed.

THE COURT: My understanding from a review of the complaint in this matter is that LHA had a written Code of Conduct that indicated that no one connected with LHA may directly or indirectly trade in any security issued by a client of LHA or engage in short sales of client securities or trade in options and so forth; and that no one connected with LHA may knowingly trade in the security of a nonclient with which a client of LHA is known to be engaging in a confidential transaction.

Are you aware of that?

THE DEFENDANT: I was never given any of that information; and like I said, the very first client I signed demanded that I buy stock and own stock and wanted a copy of my

statement to show that. And I told the firm that, and they still hired me as an independent contractor.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Williams, let me ask you, number one, is it necessary that there be a factual predicate for a duty owed to LHA not to trade on material nonpublic information; and number two, to the extent that there is, do you have a proffer as to what the government's proof on that would be?

MR. WILLIAMS: Certainly, your Honor. Yes, there does need to be a factual predicate for that.

As to whether the defendant himself has to allocute himself, the government believes it would be sufficient for us to provide a proffer as to the fact that a duty was indeed owed in light of LHA's policies that your Honor has just recounted on the record.

Furthermore, the defendant's accessing of the servers that he mentioned in his allocution demonstrate that he was given access to confidential client information and accessed those servers and used that client information without LHA's prior consent or knowledge.

As to the government's proof on this point of breach, your Honor, we would offer witness testimony with regard to LHA's policies that Mr. Lucarelli, although he didn't himself sign, was definitely made aware of and witnesses would make that clear at trial.

Furthermore, your Honor, the defendant certainly owed a duty as well to LHA clients who did not have knowledge that Mr. Lucarelli was relying on material nonpublic information contained in their draft press releases to trade.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, I'm fully aware that the question of whether a remote tippee, if you will, is aware that material nonpublic information was obtained by virtue of a breach of a duty is a live issue, shall we say.

I would imagine that insofar as we're not dealing with a remote tippee here, but nevertheless, the same principle may apply, but it may be necessary or it may later prove necessary for Mr. Lucarelli to admit or the government to prove that he was aware that his trades were in violation of a duty to LHA.

Do you have a view on that?

MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, certainly we could prove that; however, even if Mr. Lucarelli were not an employee of LHA but were simply entering the office and stealing the draft press releases, it would still be unlawful and it would still be insider trading.

The government certainly has proof that Mr. Lucarelli, as an employee of LHA or an independent contractor, owed a duty, but it's also our belief that even absent that duty, Mr. Lucarelli, if he's misappropriating the information, would still be culpable of insider trading.

THE COURT: Mr. McGinley, do you have a view on

this?

MR. MCGINLEY: I would agree with that last statement by Mr. Williams, and I believe Mr. Lucarelli will testify to that, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Except for the stealing of material nonpublic, you know, information.

THE COURT: Let me put it this way: I take it the agreement, Mr. McGinley, would be that to the extent there's a factual basis that Mr. Lucarelli misappropriated information and traded on it, that that was TREX; is that correct?

MR. MCGINLEY: That's correct.

THE COURT: Mr. Lucarelli, do you acknowledge that the material nonpublic information that you have referred to that you obtained through these draft press releases, that information, if you will, belonged to LHA and to its clients and was not yours to trade on?

Is that a fair statement?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that. I just -- I did want to say one thing on that. First I'll say yes; and then after this arrest, I looked deeply into the laws of materiality, which you know much more than me about, but including the total mix, geopolitical events and many other things that influence what a stock does.

Having said that, having never been writing press releases at LHA, having never talked to any clients at LHA or

consulting with them, if I did come across a draft press release, it could substantially change materially in the next week or two because I would not be seeing -- the process of press releases is, it doesn't become final until both parties, the client and the writer, sign off on it; and then the final procedure is, it goes to business lawyer, PR news lawyer for a release date. None of this I would be aware of. I never talked to any of the writers about any information.

So what I'm trying to say here is, yes, I did use in my decisions sometimes material nonpublic information, usually something I might see a week or two that might come out then or it might be delayed or it might never come out.

But when you look at the laws of materiality as I understand them, with the total mix and everything else, the question is, was it probable that that would work or was it merely possible? And many times, if anyone looked at my accounts, thousands of trades, I lost hundreds of thousands of dollars as well.

So, I'm going to answer yes, I did trade on material nonpublic information in my decision-making process, but as a day trader using fundamental and mainly a chartist's day trader technical analysis, I mean, the technical and fundamental is -- it just depends, every trade was different, but I'll answer yes to the question.

THE COURT: Again, you'll have an opportunity in

connection with sentencing to provide a fuller explanation if you'd like.

My task today is to determine and confirm that you are pleading guilty because you are, in fact, guilty and also to confirm that there is a factual basis for your guilty plea. Beyond that, again, you'll have an opportunity to elaborate in connection with sentencing.

Let me ask you a few other questions: Number one, you said that some of these trades were in the securities listed in the information. I take it that some of these trades, that is, trades in which you used material nonpublic information, were done in connection with, for example, the securities in TREX Company Incorporated.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You said that was at or about the times listed in the indictment. Was that between the fall of 2013 and the summer of 2014? In other words, did you trade on material nonpublic information in securities of TREX at some point in roughly that time period?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Although, the very last trade in TREX that they had -- they put in the 13-count indictment they had a copy of in a briefcase of mine, I'd like to -- I know I can't see that copy now because I would have had to plead not guilty, but I believe that that was not material based on

analyst's consensus and estimates for that earnings release, as well as the guidance. I believe it was not material. And I believe that I traded the opposite way of what the government alleges in that, not just one time, but three times.

THE COURT: Well, the information lists various trades in securities, some in connection with TREX, others in connection with FAB Universal Corporation, others in connection with PhotoMedex Incorporation and a few other entities as well.

Did you trade on material nonpublic information in connection with the purchase or sale of any of those securities between 2013 and 2014?

THE DEFENDANT: As I said before in my statement, because of the physical pain and dependence on drugs and doing thousands of trades, I can't remember which trades I might have seen a draft press release of and whether that draft press release was material, although it would have been nonpublic information.

As I traded actively, I do not recall each trade that depended on material nonpublic information, but I do recall trading all of these companies under those circumstances -- under circumstances during the periods alleged.

THE COURT: Did these trades take place in Manhattan?
THE DEFENDANT: Manhattan; yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Williams, I think maybe what would

make sense is for me to ask you what the government's evidence would be if the defendant were to go to trial; and, in particular, if you could make a proffer with respect to what evidence the government would or would introduce in connection with showing that any one of these transactions was in connection with the use of material nonpublic information, perhaps that would do it.

MR. WILLIAMS: Certainly, your Honor.

If this case were to proceed to trial, the government would offer, among other things, trading records, draft press releases, and forensic evidence showing Mr. Lucarelli's digital trail into certain share directories at LHA that contained material nonpublic information.

Furthermore, the government would call witnesses, including law enforcement witnesses, who conducted a search of Mr. Lucarelli's office at LHA and who collected physical evidence, including evidence reflecting his possession of material nonpublic information.

Specifically, the evidence would also establish that as a result of the 13 instances of insider trading specifically set forth in the information, Lucarelli earned approximately \$538,000; and also there were approximately 18 additional occasions during the course of the scheme in which he took positions in client securities on the basis of inside information and he earned approximately \$955,000 in profits.

б

With regard to the specific instances of trading set forth in the information, which are, again, illustrative but not exclusive, the government would offer specific evidence showing him accessing the draft press releases before taking a position in a client security, which, of course, would be trading in possession of material nonpublic information, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are there any additional questions that you would like me to ask Mr. Lucarelli?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. McGinley, do you know of any valid defense that would prevail at trial or do you know of any reason Mr. Lucarelli should not be permitted to plead guilty?

MR. MCGINLEY: I don't; otherwise, we wouldn't be here today.

THE COURT: Do you believe there are any additional questions that I should ask of Mr. Lucarelli?

MR. MCGINLEY: I don't.

THE DEFENDANT: I have a question.

THE COURT: Why don't you ask Mr. McGinley and then he can either ask it or --

THE DEFENDANT: I wanted to ask if I can respond very briefly to what the --

THE COURT: Why don't you speak briefly with Mr. McGinley and then he can let me know.

(Pause)

THE DEFENDANT: I have nothing to say.

THE COURT: All right. Do both counsel agree that there is a sufficient factual basis for a guilty plea to Count One of the information?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor.

MR. MCGINLEY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does either counsel know of any reason that I should not accept the defendant's plea of guilty?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.

MR. MCGINLEY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Lucarelli, because you acknowledge that you are, in fact, guilty as charged in the information, because I am satisfied that you know of your rights, including your right to go to trial, and that you are aware of the consequences of your plea, including the sentence that could be imposed upon you, and because I find that you are knowingly and voluntarily pleading guilty and because I find that there is a sufficient factual predicate for a guilty plea, I accept your guilty plea and enter a judgment of guilty on Count One of the information.

The probation department will want to interview you in connection with the presentence report that it will prepare that I have mentioned. If you choose to speak with the probation department, it is essential that anything you say is

truthful and accurate. Among other things, that report is important to me in deciding what sentence to impose upon you, and you and your lawyers will have an opportunity to review the report in advance of sentencing.

In advance of sentencing, I would urge you to review it with care. If you find any mistakes in the report or anything you wish to bring to my attention or anything in connection with your sentencing, including, again, whatever context you want to share with me regarding the crime charged in Count One, share that with your lawyers so that they can advise you on the best way to do so in the proper manner.

Understood?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. McGinley, do you wish to be present in connection with any interview for the presentence report?

MR. MCGINLEY: Yes, your Honor, I would.

THE COURT: I'll order that no interview take place unless counsel is present.

Sentencing will be set for January 8, 2015, at 3:30 in the afternoon. I direct the government to provide the probation department with its factual statement of the offense within seven days.

Defense counsel must arrange for the defendant to be interviewed by the probation department within the next two weeks.

Pursuant to my individual rules and practices for criminal cases, which is available on the Court's website, the defense submissions in connection with sentencing are due two weeks prior to sentencing; the government's submission is due one week prior to sentencing. In the event that either party does not intend to file a substantive sentencing submission, I ask that you file on ECF a letter to that effect so that we don't need to track you down.

Two last items of business: Number one, I do have here the consent preliminary order of forfeiture that appears

Two last items of business: Number one, I do have here the consent preliminary order of forfeiture that appears to have been signed by the defendant, as he confirmed earlier, and by counsel, Mr. McGinley.

Mr. McGinley, is there any objection to my signing and docketing that order?

MR. MCGINLEY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will do so.

Mr. Williams, is there any objection to the present bail conditions being continued through the date of sentencing?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor. No objection.

I'm not sure if this is necessary, but I don't know if the defendant has to admit the forfeiture allegation given that he has already signed the consent order of forfeiture, but he has not yet admitted the allegation in the information.

THE COURT: I'm not sure it is necessary insofar as he admitted it in the plea agreement, and I confirmed that he

understood and knew that earlier.

But in any event, Mr. Lucarelli, do you admit to the forfeiture allegations set forth in the information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You should understand that the conditions upon which you have been released until today are going to continue to apply through the date of your sentencing. You should also understand that any violation of those conditions could have very serious consequences for you at the time of sentencing.

Do you understand both of those things?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You should also understand that you must be in this courtroom on the date and time that I set for sentencing or, in the event that that date and time changes, on whatever date and time that I change it to.

If you are not here at that time, you should understand that you may be prosecuted for a separate crime and subject to punishment above and beyond whatever you receive in connection with your plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: It is important that you stay in touch with your lawyers to ensure that if the date and time does change, that you are advised of when you must appear.

Understood?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

MR. MCGINLEY: On the bail conditions, I just wanted to be certain that his bail conditions have been modified to the extent that travel restrictions would allow him to go to the district of North Dakota where he's going to live with his brother until such time of sentencing. I believe the U.S. Attorney's Office has agreed to that.

THE COURT: Mr. Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: We would have no objection to that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Right now, his travel conditions do not allow that. Is that correct?

MR. MCGINLEY: I don't believe they include that; I think they just have him in the Southern and Eastern Districts, but of course, he has no ability to live here in the city anymore. He has no money. His brother is going to allow him to have a room out in his house in North Dakota, and pretrial services has also approved it, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will modify the conditions to permit the defendant to travel to the district of North Dakota and travel in between North Dakota and the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

MR. MCGINLEY: Thank you.

THE COURT: Going forward, if there is any need for

E90glucp									
modification	of	bail,	you	must	consult	with	pretrial	and	the

government. And it's better practice to put it in a letter motion so there's a proper record of modifications, but bail is so modified.

Anything further, Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. McGinley.

MR. MCGINLEY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: In that case, we are adjourned. I wish you all a pleasant day.

Thank you very much.

(Adjourned)